

Notice of Allowability	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/634,777	ARAKAWA, SATOSHI	
	Examiner Constantine Hannaher	Art Unit 2878	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

All claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS (OR REMAINS) CLOSED in this application. If not included herewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTO-85) or other appropriate communication will be mailed in due course. **THIS NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RIGHTS.** This application is subject to withdrawal from issue at the initiative of the Office or upon petition by the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.313 and MPEP 1308.

1. This communication is responsive to submissions of 14 April 2004.

2. The allowed claim(s) is/are 2-11.

3. The drawings filed on 06 August 2003 are accepted by the Examiner.

4. Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some* c) None of the:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 09/385,443.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* Certified copies not received: _____.

Applicant has THREE MONTHS FROM THE "MAILING DATE" of this communication to file a reply complying with the requirements noted below. Failure to timely comply will result in ABANDONMENT of this application.
THIS THREE-MONTH PERIOD IS NOT EXTENDABLE.

5. A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION must be submitted. Note the attached EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT or NOTICE OF INFORMAL PATENT APPLICATION (PTO-152) which gives reason(s) why the oath or declaration is deficient.

6. CORRECTED DRAWINGS (as "replacement sheets") must be submitted.

(a) including changes required by the Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) attached
1) hereto or 2) to Paper No./Mail Date _____.

(b) including changes required by the attached Examiner's Amendment / Comment or in the Office action of
Paper No./Mail Date _____.

Identifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR 1.84(c)) should be written on the drawings in the front (not the back) of each sheet. Replacement sheet(s) should be labeled as such in the header according to 37 CFR 1.121(d).

7. DEPOSIT OF and/or INFORMATION about the deposit of BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL must be submitted. Note the attached Examiner's comment regarding REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEPOSIT OF BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL.

Attachment(s)

1. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	5. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
2. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	6. <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413), Paper No./Mail Date _____.
3. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statements (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08), Paper No./Mail Date <u>20040414</u>	7. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Amendment/Comment
4. <input type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit of Biological Material	8. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance
	9. <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____.

ATTACHMENT(S)

Comment on Submission(s)

1. "The amendment *found in the transmittal* is improper but moot" (emphasis supplied).

Reasons for Allowance

2. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

"As a practical matter, the Patent Office is not equipped to manufacture products by the myriad of processes put before it and then obtain prior art products and make physical comparisons therewith." *In re Brown*, 459 F.2d 531,535, 173 USPQ 685,688 (CCPA 1972). Where the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or composition, or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, a *prima facie* case of either anticipation or obviousness has been established. *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 1255, 195 USPQ 430,433 (CCPA 1977). "When the PTO shows a sound basis for believing that the products of the applicant and the prior art are the same, the applicant has the burden of showing that they are not." *In re Spada*, 911 F.2d 705, 709, 15 USPQ2d 1655, 1658 (Fed. Cir. 1990). When a claim is presented reciting "component attenuation means which attenuates high frequency components of the electric charges bearing thereon high frequency components of the image information not lower than a Nyquist frequency, which is defined by the pitches of the array of the solid radiation detecting elements, so that aliasing noise due to the high frequency components of the image information not lower than the Nyquist frequency becomes not stronger than 30% of intrinsic noise power at a frequency equal to a half of the Nyquist frequency" and the specification discloses that this function is achieved by a completely ordinary phosphor layer having a typical composition and a typical thickness (page 15), it is entirely predictable that the function should be considered inherent in the phosphor layer. The claiming of a new use, new function or unknown property which is inherently present in the prior art does not

necessarily make the claim patentable. *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 1254, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977). Accordingly, the performance of the function specified in the claims as the first requirement of making a *prima facie* case of equivalence under MPEP § 2183 was considered to have been met long ago. Nevertheless, there is a requirement that "...the allegedly inherent characteristic *necessarily* flows from the teachings of the applied prior art." *Ex parte Levy*, 17 USPQ2d 1461, 1464 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1990) (emphasis in original) and upon reconsideration in view of the emphasis applicant's representative offers for the functional limitation of the level of attenuation (page 3) and in view of the particular thickness for the phosphor layer 36 set forth in the specification which is an order of magnitude larger than that proposed by Bueno *et al.*, for example, it is agreed that the recited level of attenuation does not necessarily flow from the teachings of the applied prior art.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."


Conclusion

3. The Examiner regrets the inconsistency as to whether the Office action mailed January 14, 2004 was final or not.
4. This application has been published as US2004/0026625A1 on February 12, 2004.
5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Constantine Hannaher whose telephone number is (571) 272-2437. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday with flexible hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David P. Porta can be reached on (571) 272-2444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ch



Constantine Hannaher
Primary Examiner